

REMARKS

A number of claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,600,775 issued to King et al. that describes a method and apparatus for annotation full motion video. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner stated, " Therefore, King is teaching a system for providing a modified video signal (video with annotations) to a display without making the modification permanent (sic) to the original video." Therefore, King clearly states that the original video is unaltered and any changes are displayed on the original frames.

Accordingly, the Applicants' have amended claim 1 to specifically recite the limitation that the video frame information is permanently modified therefore rendering King non-anticipatory for exactly the reason stated above by the Examiner. Since King does not anticipate nor reasonably suggest the invention as recited in claim 1, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the U.S.C. 102(b) rejection thereof.

Independent claims 15 and 21 as amended teaches a system that recites limitation essentially the same in scope to independent claim 1 and are, therefore, also allowable.

All dependent claims depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1 and/or 15 and/or 21 and are, therefore, also allowable for at least the reasons stated for claims 1 and 15 and 21 above.

The Examiner also rejected a number of other claims as being obvious under King in view of Official Notice (at page 5, second paragraph) and as being obvious under King in view of U.S. Patent 6,507,696 issued to Chung, as well as King in view of Chung, and further, in view of U.S. Patent 6,144,375 issued to Jain. It is the Applicants' belief that none of the cited references (nor the Official Notice) add to King with regard to the claimed limitations of the invention. Therefore, the Applicants believe that the secondary references fail to cure the

deficiencies of King and request that the Examiner withdraw the obviousness type rejections thereof.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Michael J. Ferrazano
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300